



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

no matter of option with the Romanist present at the elevation of the host, whether or not he adores it. He must do so; it is the command of his Church; and yet, with marvellous inconsistency, in these very rubrics, so multiplied and various are the doubts suggested as to its real and actual consecration and transubstantiation, that no human being can by possibility be certain whether the object of this, his highest worship, is bread, or the "body, soul, and divinity" of Christ; and so as regards the wine.

As we are at present, however, employed in the task rather of culling curiosities from this singular production, we shall not pause over this view of the case, but conclude our paper by an extract or two, wherein it will be still further seen what sort of digestive apparatus it is expected that the priests of the Church of Rome should possess.

The passages about to be quoted may be familiar to some of our readers, but they are too apposite to our present purpose to permit their omission.

"X. 12. Siper negligentiam aliquid de sanguine Christi ceciderit, si quidem super terram, seu super tabulam, lingua lambatur, et locus ipse radatur quantum satis est, et abrasio comburatur; sinis vero in sacrum recondatur. Si vero super lapidem altaris ceciderit sorbet sacerdos stillam, et locus bene ablatur, et ablutio in sacrum projiciatur, &c."

"14. Si sacerdos evomat Eucharistiam, si species integre appareant, reverenter sumantur, nisi nausea fiat; tunc enim species consecrate caute separantur, et in aliquo loco sacro reponantur, donec corruptantur, et postea in sacrum projiciantur. Quod si species non appareant comburatur vomitus, et cineres in sacrum mittantur."

Will not the apocalyptic designation of Babylon—as "a cage of every unclean and hateful bird"—(Rev. xviii. 2)—appear, to some at least of our readers, as one but too well suited to a professing Christian Church which can deal in perversions of an ordinance of God, and that most sacred one, in a manner like this?

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters meant for publication should be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street, and the real name and address given, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

We earnestly request our correspondents, both Protestants and Roman Catholics, to limit the length of their communications, when possible, and not in any case to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

The CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

## The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, SEPTEMBER 16, 1858.

A LIVING Cardinal has at length reappeared in Ireland, where no Cardinal has been seen since the memorable visit of Cardinal Rinuccini, about two hundred and ten years ago.

The Church of Rome delights in outward pomp and display. The visit of a Cardinal, "a prince of the Church," affords an opportunity for inflated and ambitious language. We take our extracts from the most authentic source, the *Tablet* newspaper of Sept. 4:—

#### "CARDINAL WISEMAN'S VISIT."

"[We take the following report of the Cardinal Archbishop's progress from the *Freeman's Journal* of Wednesday]:—

"The progress of his Eminence the Cardinal Arch-

bishop of Westminster through the west of Ireland was one great ovation, in which bishops, priests, and laity vied with one another in doing honour to the illustrious prince of the Church."

"One and all regarded him as a special messenger from the same head and centre of the Church of Christ which received the glorious mission from its Divine founder: 'Go teach all nations.' Through the entire country nothing was spoken of but the visit of his Eminence, and the sick, the aged, the lame, and the blind came from remote distances to receive his blessing and to see a prince, not of any human power or of earthly creation, but a prince of the eternal Church, who derived his patent of nobility from Christ Himself."

"ATHLONE, WEDNESDAY.—It having been generally known that his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman would arrive in town on Monday, vast crowds poured in from the counties of Westmeath, Longford, and Roscommon, and the approaches to the terminus were blocked up by anxious thousands, and the platform of the terminus was filled by a number of ladies and gentlemen anxious to receive the blessing of his Eminence."

The same use was made of the railway platform at Mullingar—

"Great numbers assembled at the Mullingar station as the train approached, and his Eminence, seeing that the people were most anxious to pay their respects to him, came out of the carriage which he occupied, and gave his blessing to the kneeling crowd, after which the train proceeded at a rapid pace to Dublin."

We have heard that a great Cardinal prince was expected a few years ago at the great railway station, at Rugby, in England. Some leading Roman Catholics were drawn up in a line on the platform to receive him: the Cardinal stepped out of the train; the line advanced three steps and fell upon their knees; a railway porter was running with his box of yellow grease for the wheels; as the line suddenly advanced and knelt before him, the porter tumbled over the first gentleman, and, awful to relate, the yellow grease was discharged upon the scarlet stockings! The gentleman sprung up and collared the porter; the porter, with the pluck of an Englishman, maintained that he himself was the person entitled to complain, having been interrupted and tripped up in the discharge of his duty by persons who had no business there; "for (said the porter) a railway platform is a place of business, and not a place of public worship." We think there was sense in the observation, and we regret that the lesson appears to have been thrown away. What our Saviour said of praying at the corners of the streets (Matt. vi. 5) may not be inappropriate to kneelings on a railway platform.

The "banquet" to Cardinal Wiseman, at Balinasloe, attended by 400 priests, was chiefly remarkable by the omission to drink the health of the Queen. That omission is thus defended by the *Tablet*:—

"That omission might have been supplied in two ways, by drinking the Queen's health after that of his Holiness, or before it. By the first plan the feelings of Protestants are outraged, and Whig Catholics scandalised. By the second plan good Catholics are offended also, and in their opinion an unnecessary insult is offered to the head of the Church, whom they consider, by his position, undeserving of that contumely. It is not very pleasant, therefore, for the presidents of public dinners to be called upon to give the Queen's health at all."

The drinking of the Pope's health is placed by the *Tablet* in a new light:—

"Besides—and it is with great reluctance that we say it, for our adversaries have no claim upon us for the slightest explanation—the health of the Pope is drunk by us not as a civil ceremony; it is something like an act of faith."

It is, perhaps, significant and not unsuitable that those who are forbidden (as the Roman Catholic laity are) to use wine in that highest act of worship to Christ, of which Christ Himself said, "Drink ye ALL of it," should now be taught to drink wine as an act of religious service to the Pope!

But the *Tablet* has a further argument—it is against the religion of a Roman Catholic to drink the Queen's health! We can put no other construction on the following sentence:—

"The Catholics have never allowed the Queen's

supremacy, and it is rather too absurd for Protestants to insinuate that doctrine indirectly among us by inviting us to drink the royal toasts at dinner."

Such are the notions of loyalty and religion which the Cardinal's visit appears to have stirred up.

A simple explanation might, perhaps, be given of the omission to drink the health of the Queen. As Cardinal, Dr. Wiseman is a Roman prince, and a member of the privy council of the Pope. As such he is a Roman subject, and owes temporal as well as spiritual allegiance to the Pope. Allegiance to a foreign sovereign might be embarrassing to him.

Perhaps some difficulty may have arisen from the positive instructions given by the Pope to the last Cardinal who visited Ireland. Cardinal Rinuccini at one time professed allegiance to the Crown—not that he meant to perform it, but he thought it a legitimate artifice to deceive. The learned Roman Catholic priest and historian, Dr. Charles O'Connor, tells us how this was proved:—

"For this, Cardinal Pamfili, the Pope's Secretary of State, wrote to him from Rome, May 24, 1646, in these words:—'The Holy See never can, by any positive act, approve of the civil allegiance of Catholics subjects to an heretical prince. From this maxim of the Holy See have arisen the many difficulties and disputes in England about oaths of allegiance; and his Holiness's displeasure is the greater because you have left the original of this your speech in the hands of the Catholic confederates, which, if published, will furnish heretics with arguments against the Pope's power over heretical princes, seeing that his minister exhorts the Catholics of Ireland to allegiance to an heretical king. You must, therefore, withdraw the original, and never indulge in such speeches again!'"

And on the 10th of December, 1646, Cardinal Pamfili wrote to him again:—

"That the Pope desired that he would not by any public act show that he knew or consented to any declaration of allegiance which Irish Catholics might, for political reasons, be compelled or willing to make to the king."

Cardinal Wiseman's visit to Dundalk afforded a similar opportunity of display.

"DUNDALK, FRIDAY NIGHT.—His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster made his entry into Dundalk this day amidst a scene of enthusiastic rejoicing which has had no parallel in the history of the town, and which, though it may have been equalled, has certainly never been surpassed by any similar demonstration in this country. The decorations are probably on a more extensive scale than has ever been witnessed before in any Irish town or city."

Some of the inhabitants objected to erections which interfered with the business of the town, which has called forth the following observations:—

"It is to be regretted that Captain Fitzmaurice was so weak as to yield to the demand of the few fanatics who, it is said, called upon him to interfere in this offensive manner with the preparations of the people. The indignation which this outrageous proceeding has naturally excited in the minds of the Catholic inhabitants is, however, largely mingled with contempt for such a miserable display of intolerance and bigotry."

The Cardinal does not appear to bring peace in his train.

A Cardinal preaching in the chapel of Dundalk was, of course, a fresh occasion for display:

"Ample preparations were made in the interior of the church for the solemn and imposing ceremonies of the day. Within the sanctuary—to the left of the altar—was placed a dais covered with crimson cloth, on which was the chair of state to be occupied by his Grace the Primate. Two seats, also covered with crimson cloth, were placed to the extreme right of the altar. They were set apart for the reception of prelates. Immediately in front of the Primate's chair, and advanced to the sanctuary railing, was a platform, ascended by three steps, richly carpeted. His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop was to preach from this. To the left of the altar stood the throne whereon his Eminence was to preside at the High Mass. It was covered with scarlet damask cloth, embossed with gold flowering, and the overhanging canopy was richly fringed. The seats in the central nave and side aisles were sectioned off according to arrangement; the prices of admission being respectively, £1, 10s., 5s., and 2s. 6d."

The Church of Rome appears to have a money

value for everything. "The word of life" from a cardinal, a legate, a bishop, &c., &c., can each be set down at its respective money value. We suppose, ascertained in the ordinary way, everything is worth what it will bring.

"Shortly before noon the high altar, which was magnificently decorated for the occasion, was lighted up by a profusion of wax candles, and soon afterwards his Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Dixon, Primate, attired in gorgeous vestments, and wearing on his head the archiepiscopal mitre, came forth from the vestry, attended by two youthful train-bearers, in surplice and soutane, and followed by bishops and clergy, assumed the chair of state in readiness to receive him."

Some of our readers may think of the popular song—

"Go dress yourself, Dinah, in gorgeous array."

"The imposing and impressive ceremony prescribed by the *Pontificale Romanum*, on the occasion of High Mass celebrated in the presence of a cardinal, was then commenced—his Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Dixon officiating as high priest celebrant; the Rev. P. Hanratty, assistant-priest; the Rev. R. O'Sullivan, deacon; the Rev. G. Weir, sub-deacon. *Masters of the Ceremonies*—The Rev. F. M'Ginity and the Rev. J. Levens."

We suppose two "masters of ceremonies" were necessary where ceremonies were so many. By the way, which did the ball-room adopt the "master of the ceremonies" from the Church of Rome, or the Church of Rome from the ball-room?

"The Rev. Dr. Russell officiated as assistant-priest to the Cardinal; and the Rev. Monsignor Clifford and the Rev. Mr. Burke as assistant-deacons at the throne. The aspect of the interior of the sanctuary during the celebration of high mass was brilliant in the extreme, and the sight of one of the illustrious princes of the Church—illustrious because of his virtues and his learning—presiding *in state* at the offering up of the holy sacrifice, surrounded by venerable prelates and a large body of clergy, must have filled the hearts of the devout congregation with fervent devotion and thanksgiving to God that they were allowed to assist on an occasion so interesting and impressive, and which will be so memorable in the annals of the Catholic religion in this country."

One would suppose that the "sacrifice of the mass," if really believed, would suggest thoughts more engrossing and absorbing than these. Can Christ Himself become subordinate to the pomp of His minister?

Then follows a most disappointing paragraph: "We are unable to give even an outline of the brilliant and eloquent discourse of his Eminence, which occupied an hour and a quarter in its delivery. At the conclusion of the sermon his Eminence descended from the platform and resumed his seat on the throne."

We should have liked to have read a sermon from a Cardinal on either of these texts—

"CHRIST WAS ONCE OFFERED TO EXHAUST the sins of many."—Douay Bible, Heb. ix. 28.

"We are sanctified by the OBLATION of the BODY of Jesus Christ ONCE."—Douay Bible, Heb. x. 10.

"By ONE OBLATION He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

It may, perhaps, have been felt to be inexpedient to expose the sermon of a Cardinal prince to examination by the Scripture. The following extract from the *Tablet* may account for the suppression of the Cardinal's sermon:—

"It is to be regretted that the souper element, from which even this place is not free, developed itself this morning in one of the most sneaking as well as insulting forms—namely, the appearance of handbills, which were shoved surreptitiously, over night, under the doors of nearly all the Catholic shopkeepers of the town, calling upon the Cardinal Archbishop to prove from Scripture the doctrines of the Catholic religion. This precious document purports to be signed by the Protestant curate of Dundalk and three other worthy 'gentlemen,' who feel sorely chafed in spirit at the striking manifestation of Catholic piety which they were obliged to witness in the interesting events of the last two days."

Surely, it was the man who wrote this who was really "chafed," and not the Curate of Dundalk.

The *Tablet* quotes from the *Dundalk Democrat* newspaper the following lamentation over the reception they were able to give the Cardinal:—

"As a nation, we can review no national army in his

presence; we cannot exhibit an Irish fleet, or man the yards to do him honour; nor can we display great wealth to dazzle his imagination. Our glory in that respect has passed away."

The *Democrat*, indeed, says—

"He comes as an ambassador from Heaven; as a prince whose kingdom is not of this world."

Yet how glorious it would have been to have presented him with a "national army" and a fleet, independent of England, and hostile to it—with swords, guns, blunderbusses, and cannons!

The idea is not so strange as it may seem. The *Democrat* evidently had in his mind that the last Cardinal who appeared in Ireland, Rinuccini, had come to organize and direct an army in rebellion against the Crown.

Neither is the idea at all inconsistent with the system of the Church of Rome at this day. All great offices of state at Rome are held by cardinals, bishops, and priests. Dr. Wiseman, if resident at Rome, might not unnaturally be secretary of state or minister of war. The insurrection at Rome, in 1848, was mainly directed against cardinals holding such offices.

Possibly, our readers may now like to know what "a cardinal" really is, and how there came to be cardinals.

In the foregoing extracts a cardinal is called an "illustrious prince of the Church;" "a prince, not of any human power, or of earthly creation, but a prince of the eternal Church, who derived his patent of nobility from Christ Himself;" "an ambassador from Heaven, whose kingdom is not of this world."

We wonder no Roman Catholic has yet thought of starting the notion, that as the Pope is the successor of Peter, so the cardinals are the successors of the other Apostles. We have not yet seen it asserted, but possibly it may yet be discovered and become an article of faith.

In the meantime, our readers may be content to learn the origin of "cardinals" from the learned Roman Catholic canonist, Paul Sarpi.\*

"When churchmen of merit happened, by the calamities of war, to be driven from their ministry, and received into other Churches, where they were maintained out of the common purse, in the same manner with the clergy of the place; as any vacancy happened, by death or otherwise, it was filled by some one of the strange clergy, who, being thus provided for, was called *incardinatus*;" and he who stepped into a ministry, having had none before, was called *ordinatus*.

"This usage began in Italy before the year 600, when many bishops and other clergymen were plundered and driven from their cures by the ravages of the Lombards, and were thus re-placed in other Churches as ministries became vacant. The bishops were called *Episcopi Cardinales*, and the priests *Presbyteri Cardinales*.

"Now, the greatest part of those who were so driven from their own Churches, betaking themselves to those of Rome and Ravenna, which were the richest and had the most employments in the ministry to give, and these strangers finding a welcome reception there . . . it rarely happened that any of their own people were ordained, but commonly strangers; and this was the reason why, in these two Churches, all who had any ministry were called *cardinales*—a name which still remains in the Church of Rome, but not in the Church of Ravenna, where Paul III. abrogated it in the year 1543.

"Thus the name of 'Cardinal,' which first derived itself from a very low and abject condition, is by a change of signification become a title so elevated that cardinals are now said to be *quasi Cardines omnium terrarum*,<sup>c</sup> and that which at first was no degree nor order in the Church, but introduced by mere accidents of calamity, is exalted to that pitch of human grandeur and dignity which we see it in possession of at this day.

"But whoever will look into the most celebrated councils held at Rome will find that the cardinal Roman priests, in their public writings, have always signed under the Italian bishops, and that even in after time no bishop was made a cardinal priest.

"The first bishops who were made cardinals were persons of note who had been driven from their Churches; for instance, Conrad, Bishop of Mentz, who, having been treated as a rebel by the Emperor Frederick I., was received with open arms by Pope Alexander III., and made cardinal of St. Sabin. In those days, and until

the times of Pope Innocent IV., the cardinals wore no habit, nor any mark of distinction. He gave them the red hat on Christmas eve in the year 1244, and Paul II. added the red cap, to be worn by all the cardinals except such as were monks or regulars; yet to these also it hath been granted since by Gregory XIV.

"We have thought a short deduction of this splendid order from its origin necessary in this place, as it concerns so eminent a dignity, and for which this day holds the second place in the Church, and for which the world seems not to afford titles POMPUS ENOUGH. (Urban VIII., who reigns at present, gave them the title of 'eminence' by a solemn bull)."<sup>d</sup>

From this it appears that the only authority rightfully belonging to a cardinal, as such, is to be the rector of a parish church in Rome. The rectors in Rome and Ravenna came accidentally to be called *Cardinales*. It was an ancient rule in the Church that the rectors of the city parishes were the council of the bishop for the administration of the diocese. When the Pope took the world for his diocese, then the rectors of churches in the city of Rome became his council for the administration of the universal Church. Their rise, like his, was founded on usurpation. Rectors of the parishes of Rome let them be, if only they will preach the Gospel in sincerity; but to claim universal power in the Church, in right of their being rectors of parishes in Rome, while they entirely disregard the duties of those parishes, is to build a house of human pomp and vanity upon the sand. Dr. Wiseman is a "Cardinal" only in virtue of being parish priest of a church in Rome. Let him attend his church, and perform its duties as a parish priest, and business will go on all the better on the railway platforms of England and Ireland. He need not then drink the Queen's health, nor need Irishmen provide him with "National Armies" or "Fleets."

Since the foregoing was written we have seen in the *Tablet* of September 11 that Dr. Wiseman did drink the Queen's health at a "Banquet" at Dundalk; and thus, according to the *Tablet*, Dr. Wiseman has swallowed the Queen's supremacy in his cups.

Dr. Kiernan thought it necessary to say that they drank the Queen's health, "not to meet these charges which those who made them knew to be false, but because they really wished to avail themselves of every opportunity to express their friendship and feelings of loyal attachment to her gracious Majesty." If the 400 priests at Ballinasloe had really the same wish, why did they not do the same? who hindered them? Dr. Kiernan gave the Queen's health after the Pope's, which the *Tablet* says is an "insult" to Protestants and "Whig Catholics."

The Banquet at Dundalk presents a curious feature, but we believe not uncommon among Irish Roman Catholic priests. We copy from the *Tablet*:—

"His Eminence was entertained at a public banquet last evening (Friday), at which over 200 persons were present. The dinner, consisting entirely of fish, was served in excellent style by Mr. Polson, of Dublin."

Imagine a Cardinal, Archbishops, Bishops, and Priests, 200 in number, "Banqueting" upon a fast, prepared "in excellent style" by the best cooks that could be brought from Dublin, to stimulate the eminent, most reverend, and right reverend appetites in their fast! We have seldom seen a better exposition of the Roman doctrine of fasting.

If fasting be intended for the mortification of the bodily appetites, would not the Prophet Isaiah have applied to this, too, the stern reproof, "Is this such a fast as I have chosen. . . wilt thou call this a fast?" Isaiah lxiii. 5. (Douay Bible).

\* Treatise on Ecclesiastical Benefices, ch. 12. Jenkins, tr., Dublin, 1787; p. 39.

<sup>b</sup> The word *incardinatus*, in this sense, means simply "transplanted."

<sup>c</sup> That is, "the hinges of the whole earth," as if all turned on them.

<sup>d</sup> This last sentence must have been added by an editor, as Pope Urban VIII. did not begin to reign until the year 1623, and Father Paul Sarpi was dead before that time.